

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 24-36 are pending in this application, with claims 24 and 31 being the only independent claims. Claims 1-23 were previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 24-27, 29, 30, and 31 are currently amended.

Claims 24-26, 28-31, 33, and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,786,897 (Takanashi) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,603,485 (Forman).

Claims 27, 32, 34, and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Takanashi and Forman, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,933,923 (Feinstein).

Independent claim 24 is amended to recite

“concurrently displaying the cursor and only a displayed part of a virtual view on the display of the electronic device, wherein the virtual view is larger than a size of the display and comprises an entire spatially arranged data set in which a user of the electronic device navigates, and the cursor is continuously visible on the display at a cursor location so that the deviation of the cursor from the center of the display is proportional to the deviation of the location of the concurrently displayed part of the virtual view from an origin of the virtual view” and

“changing the location of the cursor during the step of changing the displayed part so that the deviation of the cursor from the center of the display is always proportional to the deviation of the location of the concurrently displayed part of the virtual view from the origin of the virtual view,

wherein the cursor is always visible on the display when any part of the virtual view is displayed on the display such that the cursor location provides, to a user of the electronic device, continuous navigation information for scrolling within the whole virtual view.”

Thus, the cursor is always visible when any part of the virtual view is displayed such that the location of the cursor on the display always represents a location of the displayed part in relation to the whole virtual view. That is, the cursor provides an indication of the location of the displayed

part within the virtual view both during scrolling and when the displayed part is viewed in steady state.

The combination of Takanashi and Forman fails to disclose the above limitations.

According to Takanashi, a window area 5 on a logical screen 4 is displayed in a view port 2 on a physical screen 1 (see col. 1, lines 56-59; and Fig. 1A of Takanashi). An operation menu 3 with a jumpscroll-icon 3' is also shown on the screen 1 (see col. 1, lines 59-61). When a user wishes to view a different part of the logical screen 4, the user selects the jumpscroll-icon 3' (col. 1, lines 61-65). In response to this selection of the jumpscroll-icon 3', the display screen changes to the state shown in Fig. 1B, in which a rectangle corresponding to logical screen 4 is displayed in the view port 2 with the area 5 displayed as a rectangle 7 (see col. 1, line 65 to col. 2, line 4). To move the window area 5 to a new location, the user drags rectangle 7 to a position 9 in Fig. 1C (see col. 2, lines 4-9). When the operation menu is selected in the state of Fig. 1C, i.e., with the rectangle 7 moved to position 9, a new window area 5' of logical screen 4, which corresponds to position 9, is displayed in the view port 2 of the screen 1.

Thus, the logical screen 4 of Takanashi corresponds to the claimed virtual view, the window area 5 of Takanashi is a part of the logical screen 4, and the rectangle 7 corresponds to the claimed cursor because the rectangle indicates a location of window area 5 within the logical screen 4. However, rectangle 7 is not visible when only the window area 5 is displayed in the view port 2, as evidenced in Fig. 1A of Takanashi.

Since the rectangle 7 is not visible to indicate the location of the window area 5 within the logical screen 2 when only the window area 5 is displayed in the view port 2, Takanashi can not be considered to disclose "concurrently displaying the cursor and only a displayed part of a virtual view on the display of the electronic device, wherein the virtual view is larger than a size of the

display and comprises an entire spatially arranged data set in which a user of the electronic device navigates, and the cursor is continuously visible on the display at a cursor location so that the deviation of the cursor from the center of the display is proportional to the deviation of the location of the concurrently displayed part of the virtual view from an origin of the virtual view”, as expressly recited in independent claim 24.

Forman fails to teach or suggest what Takanashi lacks. Forman discloses a computer cursor spotlight. According to Forman, an entire screen 101 is masked or covered by a mask 201, except for a small display area surrounding the cursor 205 (see col. 2, line 66 to col. 3, line 5 of Forman). Thus, Forman simply discloses that the cursor 205 opens a window or display area in a mask that covers the remainder of the display screen. Forman discloses nothing about displaying a part of a virtual view that is larger than the display screen. Moreover, even if a virtual view were applied to the screen of Forman, the cursor 205 simply moves around the currently displayed portion of the virtual view and the location of the cursor 205 has no relation to the location of the displayed part within the entire virtual view.

Accordingly, the combination of Takanashi and Forman fails to disclose “concurrently displaying the cursor and only a displayed part of a virtual view on the display of the electronic device, wherein the virtual view is larger than a size of the display and comprises an entire spatially arranged data set in which a user of the electronic device navigates, and the cursor is continuously visible on the display at a cursor location so that the deviation of the cursor from the center of the display is proportional to the deviation of the location of the concurrently displayed part of the virtual view from an origin of the virtual view”, as expressly recited in independent claim 24.

Independent claim 31 includes limitations similar to those of independent claim 24 and should be allowable for at least the same reasons.

Dependent claims 25-30 and 32-36 are allowable for the same reasons as are independent claims 24 and 31, as well as for the additional recitations contained therein.

The application is now deemed to be in condition for allowance and early notice to that effect is solicited.

Should the Examiner have any comments, questions, suggestions, or objections, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned in order to resolve any outstanding issues.

Respectfully submitted,
COHEN PONTANI LIEBERMAN & PAVANE LLP

By /Alfred W. Froebrich/
Alfred W. Froebrich
Reg. No. 38,887
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210
New York, New York 10176
(212) 687-2770

Dated: January 19, 2010